

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,534	05/12/2004	Bradley P. Jones	FIS920040035US1	3533
29371	7590 02/14/2006		EXAMINER	
	OLBURN LLP - IBM FI	COLEMAN, WILLIAM D		
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2823	
			DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/709,534	JONES ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
·	W. David Coleman	2823			
The MAILING DATE of this communi Period for Reply	cation appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum states a Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply. Any reply received by the Office later than three months at earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reunication. tutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON will, by statute, cause the application to become AB.	CATION. Sply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <u>08 December 2005</u> .				
,					
3) Since this application is in condition	e this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practic	ce under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 6-12</u> is/are pending	in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ar	re withdrawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6 and 12</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) <u>7-11</u> is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restric	tion and/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the					
10) $igotimes$ The drawing(s) filed on ${\it 08~December}$					
Applicant may not request that any object					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form P10-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim a) All b) Some * c) None of:	for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
, , ,	documents have been received.				
	documents have been received in A	pplication No			
•	of the priority documents have been				
	nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office actio	n for a list of the certified copies not	received.			
Attachmont(c)					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P	· — /	s)/Mail Date			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date ___

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

Application/Control Number: 10/709,534 Page 2

Art Unit: 2823

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 8, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- 2. Applicants contend that Wieczorek et al., U.S. Patent 6,207,563 B1 herein known as Wieczorek fails to teach "a counter tensile layer over a second layer, wherein said counter tensile layer is selected from a material such that an opposing directional stress is created between said counter tensile layer and said second layer, with respect to a directional stress created between said first layer and said second layer".
- In response to Applicants contention that Wieczorek fails to disclose "a counter tensile layer over a second layer, wherein said counter tensile layer is selected from a material such that an opposing directional stress is created between said counter tensile layer and said second layer, with respect to a directional stress created between said first layer and said second layer". Please note the following comments. First and foremost "the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer." Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc., 190 F.3d 1342, 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). In this case Applicant's claims addressing the stress between materials is an inherent property. The term "counter tensile" is equivalent to the term "compressive" which is a term ordinarily used in the art. The Examiner provides a supplemental reference of

Application/Control Number: 10/709,534 Page 3

Art Unit: 2823

Yamada et al., U.S. Patent 6,344,411 B1 which discloses that annealing has a direct relationship to compressive stress and tensile stress in which the property of compressive stress is converted to tensile stress. Applicant's term of "counter tensile", is merely nothing more than compressive stress. Yamada teaches that titanium nitride has a large compressive stress (which is equivalent to Applicants "counter tensile" term, see column columns 3 and 4 wherein after annealing changes the compressive stress into a tensile stress, column 4, lines 4-15). Because Wieczorek teaches annealing layer 70 which is titanium nitride with layer 66 which can be titanium nitride (see column 6, lines 41-48), the stress between the two materials are changed.

- 4. Applicants contend that Wieczorek reveals that there is no additional layer whatsoever that is formed over the cap layer 70 in Figures 6 and 7.
- 5. In response to Applicants contention that Wieczorek does not teach an additional layer over the cap layer, Applicants are miss-directing the prior art rejection. Wieczorek clearly discloses a refractory metal to form cobalt silicide layer 64, than forming metal layer 66 over layer 64 and then forming layer 70 over layer 66. Because Applicants claim a cap layer over the refractory metal, Applicants are inter-mixing the true meaning of the term "cap layer" and the actual location of the film layer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Application/Control Number: 10/709,534 Page 4

Art Unit: 2823

7. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wieczorek et al., U.S. Patent 6,207,563 B1.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 8. Claims 1-4 allowed.
- 9. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art does not teach the compressive stress or Applicants term "counter tensile" layer over the titanium nitride layer being the same material as the first layer below the titanium nitride layer.
- 10. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Objections

11. Claims 7-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

- Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
- 13. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

 MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

 MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2823

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

- 14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to W. David Coleman whose telephone number is 571-272-1856. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 AM 5:30 PM.
- 15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
- Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

W. David Coleman Primary Examiner Art Unit 2823